



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,122	08/27/2007	Brian Morgan	56446-20128.00/D2050-2N	5578
45975 7590 09/11/2009 VERENIUM C/O MOFO S.D. 12531 HIGH BLUFF DRIVE SUITE 100 SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2040				
EXAMINER CHANDRAKUMAR, NIZAL S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/11/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/576,122

**Applicant(s)**

MORGAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

NIZAL S. CHANDRAKUMAR

**Art Unit**

1625

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NIZAL S. CHANDRAKUMAR.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Gregory Einhorn.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 17 August 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 18-20, 37, 47 and 53.

Identification of prior art discussed: X.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: 112-1 Breadth of claims was discussed. Non-enabling disclosure with respect to protein fragments capable of enzymatic activity/specificity was discussed. 112-2; inconsistent use of terms acyl and acetyl was noted. Potential rejections under 102/103 of claims 20 and 53 also were pointed; prior art disclosed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/D. Margaret Seaman/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03)

Interview Summary

Paper No. 20090908